

(SRI S. NIJALINGAPPA)

getting quite a lot of money. Therefore, we shall not say that what is paid to them is very high. No doubt, from a common point of view, it may look a bit high. They must be kept free of troubles, free of economic difficulties; therefore, their pay is made purposely high and when they are transferred they have to adjust themselves. Therefore, something more has to be given.

I do not think there is any thing more for me to say. There is welcome for this, except that certain criticisms were made. I request the House to ratify the Resolution. Possibly they will read the Debate as published. I request the House to ratify the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“ That this House ratifies the amendments to the Constitution of India, proposed to be made by the Constitution (15th Amendment) Bill, 1963, as passed by Houses of Parliament.”

The Resolution was Adopted.

Official Resolution re : Ratification of the 16th Amendment to the Constitution

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—I beg to move :

“ That this House ratifies the amendments to the Constitution of India, proposed to be made by the Constitution (16th Amendment) Bill, 1963 as passed by Houses of Parliament.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Resolution moved :

“ That this House ratifies the amendments to the Constitution of India, proposed to be made by the Constitution (16th Amendment) Bill, 1963 as passed by Houses of Parliament.”

† Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—Sir, this is a simple measure and I think nobody will speak against the spirit underlying the passing of this Bill by the Parliament. I am sure that what has been urged already would not be urged again. Enough has been said and there is nothing in urging the same point. Sir, there are certain attempts to interfere with the unity of this country. There are certain political parties which think of disintegrating the country. This has to be put an end to. It is with that end in view, that the Government appointed the National Integration Council who recommended that when Members set up as candidates to the Legislatures or the Central Legislature, they must make it a point and take an Oath that they stand for the integration of this country. Therefore, it is a simple amendment and I do not think Members may speak much about it. I commend it for the ratification of the House.

† ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಂ. ದೇವ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ ತಿರುಳಾದ ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ

ನ್ಯಾಯಪದ್ಧತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಪ್ಯಾಟರ್ನ್ ಎನ್ನುವ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಧೈಯವನ್ನು ಪರಿಪಾಲಿಸಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಬಂದ ತಕ್ಷಣ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅರ್ಥ ಇರುತ್ತಾ ಇತ್ತು—ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರಕುವ ಹಾಗೆ, ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅದು ಒಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಇಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಉಗ್ರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇರುವಾಗ ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದದ್ದರಿಂದ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಇದು ಒಂದು ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತದೆ—ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ಬಂದು 16 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ವರೆಗೂ ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಇದ್ದು ಈಗ ತಂದಿರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಫೈಲ್ಯಾರು ಎಂದು ಜೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹಾರ್ಟ್‌ನರ್ಚಿಂಗ್ ಆಗಿರಬೇಕು, ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ತಾರ್ಕಿಕವಾಗಿ ನೋಡಿದರೂ ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ನ್ಯಾಯಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧನವಾಗಿ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನೀವೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಅದು ಪರಿಣಾಮಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲು ಆಡಳಿತ ವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ—ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ—ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವೇ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ತತ್ವದವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಯಾದ ತಿಳಿವಳಿಕೆ ಇದೆಯೇ? ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ತರಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬರಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಜಸ್ಟಿಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಆಯುಧ ಯಾವುದು ಎಂದರೆ ಸಮಾಜ ವಾದದ ತತ್ವ. ಅದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಆರೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ನೀವು ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲೂ ತಪ್ಪಾದರೂ ಹಿಡಿದಿರುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇದನ್ನು ಅನಲ್ಯೆಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಸಮಾಜವಾದದ ತಿರುಳನ್ನು ಅನ್ವಯ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಇಷ್ಟು—ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಪವಿತ್ರವಾದುದು. ಅದು ಎಷ್ಟು ಅಗಾಧವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದೂ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರಬಾರದು ಎಂದರೆ ಅದು ತಪ್ಪಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಿದ್ದಾಗ ತರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೂ ಕೂಡ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ ಧೈಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯ ರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ತೊಂದರೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಅಂಥ ತಪ್ಪು ಆದರೆ ಆಗ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಏನು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ತುರ್ತು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇದೆ; ಅದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದರ ಹಾರ್ಟ್‌ನರ್ಚಿಂಗ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸಮಾಜವಾದದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟತೆ ಇದೆಯೋ, ಅದನ್ನು ಬೀಫ್ ಮಿಸ್ಟರು ದೆಹಲಿಯಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸಮಾಜವಾದ ಎಂದು ಇಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ, ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಾಗ ಅದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು—ಸಮಾಜವಾದ ಎಂದರೆ ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಪ್ಯಾಟರ್ನ್ ಎಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಇನ್ನೇನೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಆದರಿಂದ ತುರ್ತು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸಮಾಜವಾದದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ತರಹ ಇದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ, ಆ ತರಹ ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ಈ ತರಹ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ತರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, I am in agreement with the principles of this amendment. It primarily underlines the unity of this country. There have not been many instances wherein that unity has been questioned effectively. It is always a salutary principle which the Legislatures have to bear in mind that the Constitution is something sacred and should not be tampered with too often, as is being done in this country. Our Constitution is the product of a great deal of deliberation, contemplation, debate and consideration at the hands of the founding-fathers of our Constitution. It will be worth our time to ponder over the question as to, in similar circumstances, how democratic Republics in other countries would have acted. My own thoughts go to that of the United States of America. It has been a democratic Republic for 170 or 180 years and in all their existence they have amended their Constitution about 17 or 18 times.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How many articles are there in that Constitution ?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—They have far fewer articles than we have. That is all the more the reason why we should not have attempted to amend the Constitution so frequently. The fact that we have given the highest consideration to every article enshrined in the Constitution goes to strengthen my argument that it should not be amended of and on.

Sir, the amendment before the House is certainly something to be lauded. All of us know that in certain parts of our country there has been a tendency, a loose talk of cessation or division. The Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam of Madras State want to create a separate Dravidanad in India, or out of India. If anybody advocates the theory of separation we will have to look at such attitude or movement with great suspicion. We will have to suspect their *bona fides*, their loyalty, etc. This particular amendment goes to strengthen the unity that can be seen in all parts of the country today. But one thing really bothers me, that is the time factor involved in this. We are trying to amend the Constitution when the nation is under an Emergency. External dangers and external aggression, have alarmed the country and even a political party which speaks of cessation has declared that when the Chinese are menacing the borders of India, they as a political party will fight the Chinese menace. This has been the declared policy of even an extreme political party like the D. M. K. of Madras. It would have been quite reasonable to have taken them by the assurance to the country. Nonetheless this amendment has been passed by the Houses of Parliament and it is now before us for ratification. The Chief Minister, while introducing this official resolution, pointed out that this was a very simple measure. I am likely to agree with the Chief Minister. This is a simple measure inasmuch as it claims of every person, who wants to be a candidate either to the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha or to a State Legislature, to take an oath that he would work within the framework of the Constitution and also that he would not endanger the unity of this country. I have personally no hesitation in taking an oath like this. All the Legislatures of our country, in fact every fact of our activity, are within the framework of the Constitution. If anybody tries to endanger the situation, we can always take resort to the court of law to establish the supremacy of the Constitution. After all the oath to be made by a Member of the Legislature of a State is a very simple one. We have all taken the oath before we started functioning as Members of this august House. One thing we shall have to bear in mind, that is, the unity of this country must not be taken for granted. The unity may be threatened not only by forces which cry hoarse about separation but, also forces that work in the name of language, in the name of one community or the other, in the name of establishing a national language and so on. They might at a particular time take dangerous shapes and go out-of-hand. We will have to be eternally vigilant where the unity of this country is concerned, where the supremacy of the Constitution is threatened. This measure might ultimately go to reinforce the unity of this country and it might also be a source of inspiration to one and all, to defend the frontiers, to defend the inviolability of this sacred country of ours.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will extend the time of discussion on this resolution till 4.30 P. M.

4-00 P.M.

†Sri V.S. PATIL (Belgaum).—Sir, as the Hon'ble Chief Minister said this is a simple measure, I agree with him because it covers a few words and about two pages. But, the intention and the purpose which underlines it, at the present moment during the emergency, is laudable. There is no question about it. The integrity of our country must be maintained at any cost and there are no two opinions about that. But, we have to make some distinction between the imposed loyalty and the loyalty that springs from the heart. We must create such conditions in our country that loyalty to the Constitution must spring from the heart of every citizen. It should not be the one imposed by force of law and we have got a very bad experience of this at the time when our country achieved independence. Because of certain suspicions of the Muslim community which is the majority community in the present Pakistan, they felt that they must have their own separate State. Their suspicion was that when once they were included in India, they might not get their legitimate rights and our politicians at that time failed to convince them. Even now, we are independent. It means the people of this country are independent. As we have seen in recent times, the imposition of Hindi is opposed by some of the States or people from South India. If we impose such things upon them, it is likely that this imposition may come in the way of integrity itself because forcing something upon unwilling people may create the contrary effect for the prevention of which we are now trying through this amendment. If these schedules and amendments to the Constitution are enforced, many people from South India will come forward and say that "our liberty of speech is gagged by the Northerners." This will definitely be the reaction especially of those who are suspicious about the *bona fide* of the national language and other matters in our country. They clearly say "allegiance to the Constitution of India as by law established"—it is perfectly right. Further, it is said: "I will uphold the sovereignty". That is also correct. But, about the integrity, some people may.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Integrity of the country is unassociated with any language whatsoever.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—That is the fear that was expressed by D. M. K.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is unfounded.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—That is why I suggest that we have to convince the people; it is not separation of those people but for maintaining the unity of India and for making our country as strong as possible, and for the purpose of defending it against any aggression either internal or external, that we are amending this. They must be convinced. Without conviction, it will defeat the very purpose for which we simply

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

impose the law. That is why I give qualified support to this measure. Our Government must take proper steps to see that the people are convinced that the fissiparous policies that are now and for a long time creating some sort of disturbance in the country are not proper and conducive so far as the integration of the country is concerned. The conviction must come from the hearts, but not imposed by law. That must be done by our leaders. This alone will be more practicable and then no question of taking an oath will arise.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಸಂಸತ್ತು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸುವ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿರುವ ಹದಿನಾರನೆಯ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈಗ ತಾನೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯ ರಾಡ ಶ್ರೀ ಪಾಟೀಲರವರು ಏನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದೋ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನೂ ಸಮರ್ಥಿಸಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾವು ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಆದರೆ ಅದು ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಕೇಳಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಸಂಶಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಹಾಗೆ ಆಪಾದಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಅವರು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಕಾಮರಾಜ ಸೂತ್ರ ಬೇಕಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೆನ್ನರು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

✓ Mr. SPEAKER.—Kindly come to the subject matter.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವ ಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೇ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಇದ್ದುಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಕೆಲಸ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಈ ರೀತಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗ ಒಂದು ಪವಿತ್ರವಾದ ಗ್ರಂಥ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಮನ ಬಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಮಂಜಸವಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಅನುಕೂಲಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಹಾಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇಡೀ ಜನಾಂಗದ ಹಿತ ಅನುಲಕ್ಷಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋದರೆ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಈಚೆಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಗಡಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪುತ್ಯೇಕವಾದ ನಾಡನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಕೇಳಿಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಆ ಭಾವನೆಗಳಿಂದ ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಬಹಳ ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂದು ಸಂಸತ್ತಿನವರು ಭಾವಿಸಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾವ ಪುಸ್ತಕದಲ್ಲೋ ಆಗಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಕಟುವಾಗಿ, ನಿಷ್ಠುರವಾಗಿ ಬರೆದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದನ್ನು ಜಗತ್ತಿನ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಅದರಂತೆ ನಡೆದದ್ದು ಉಂಟೋ ಎಂಬುದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಬ್ರಿಟನ್ನಿನ ಜನ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವರು ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಗ್ರಂಥ ಬರೆದಿಡಲು ಟ್ಟಾಗ ಅದು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಆಳುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಸುರಕ್ಷಿತ, ನಾವು ಐಕ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಹುದು ಎನ್ನುವ ಭಾವನೆ ನಮಗೆ ಸಮರ್ಥನೆ ಕಂಡುಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಭಾರತದ ಸಾರ್ವಭೌಮತ್ವ ಮತ್ತು ಸಮಗ್ರತೆ, ಇವೆರಡನ್ನೂ ಕಾಪಾಡಬೇಕು. ಭಾರತದ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ನಾಗರಿಕನೂ ಈ ಭಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಮೂಲ ಭಾವನೆ. ಕೇವಲ ಭಾವನೆಗಳಿಂದ, ಆಧಾರ ಕೇವಲ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಭಾವನೆಗಳಿಂದ, ನಾವು ಈ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಸಾರ್ವಭೌಮತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸಮಗ್ರತೆಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೆ ಅನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ, ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಅನ್ನುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಅಣ್ಣತಮ್ಮಂದಿರಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅವನೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಟು ಹೋಗುವಾಗ ಯಾವವಿಗೂ ಅಸ್ತಿಪಾಸ್ತಿದೊರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೇ ಹೊರತು, ಹೊರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೆ ಸಮ್ಮತಿಯಿಲ್ಲ ಅನ್ನುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೇನೇ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವತ್ತು ನಾವು ಒತ್ತಾಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬನೂ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಷ್ಠೆಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇ ಆದರೆ, ಅಪ್ರಶ್ನರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೂ ಆ ಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ, ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಆ ಭಾತನ್ನು ಪರಿಪಾಲಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆಯೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ.

ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಏನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಐಕ್ಯದ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನಾಡಿ, ಅಗತ್ಯದ ಕೃತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರವಾಗಲಿ, ಸಂಸತ್ತಾಗಲಿ, ಐಕ್ಯತೆಗೆ ಭಂಗ ತರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಿಂದ ಕೇವಲ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಸಂತೋಷ ಉಂಟಾಗಬಹುದೇ ಹೊರತು, ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕೃತಿಯ, ಏನೂ ಸಾಧನೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ದೇಶದ ಐಕ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕನ್ಯಾಕುಮಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಹಿಮಾಚಲದವರೆಗೆ ನಾವು ಐಕ್ಯತೆ ಭಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ಉಂಟು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕಂಥ, ಎಲ್ಲ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಎಲ್ಲ ಜನರೂ ಸಮಾನರು ಎನ್ನುವ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಆಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕು. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತನ್ನ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಯಾರು ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆಯೋ, ಅವರು ಸಂಶಯದಿಂದ ನೋಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ; ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರ ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾದ, ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈಡೇರಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಶ್ರಮ ಮತ್ತು ಆಸಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† Sri S. RAJAGOPAL (K. G. F.).—I would like to speak in Tamil, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may speak in any language. But he must be brief. Let the Hon'ble Member take five minutes. The Hon'ble Member has already told me that he is supporting it.

Sri S. RAJAGOPAL.—[Spoke in Tamil.]

*

*

*

Sri S. RAJAGOPAL.—The ruling party is responsible for that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it here or elsewhere ?

Sri S. RAJAGOPAL.—Ruling Party of India is responsible, Sir.

[He continued his speech in Tamil.]

Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—Sir, taking oath or making affirmation to Parliament and Legislature has already been provided for in the Constitution and that is being amended. I may also say that affirmation or oath to be made by a candidate for election to Parliament, that is, even before the election takes place is necessary. A candidate duly nominated is required to take oath or make affirmation. I do not know what is the real need for such a provision in this amending Bill, because the purpose is served by the inclusion of such a provision under the Representation of the People Act. If really there was any need for it, there was every scope for making a provision in the Representation of the People Act, to make it incumbent on the candidate to make the affirmation or to take the oath.

It is not known whether after the oath is taken, he may retire or he may withdraw from the contest ? Such a contingency is there. Why should there be any provision in the Constitution, that too for a candidate who seeks to contest the election to Parliament or Houses of Legislature, to take an oath or affirmation ? That could have been avoided by making suitable provisions in the Representation of the People's Act. But the other amendments are really welcome.

✓ **Mr. SPEAKER.**—Article 173 pertains to qualification for membership of the State Legislature. A condition to be fulfilled before he becomes eligible to offer himself as a candidate is provided in that article. How does Hon'ble Member say that it can be done under the People's Representation Act?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—As a pre-requisite to file a nomination it could have been done. I do not think there is anything wrong in making such a provision in the Representation of the Peoples Act. Why it has been specially provided in the Constitution has not been clearly enunciated.

So far as other matters are concerned, they are matters to be welcomed. In order to maintain the integrity of India, this provision was included when the original Constitution was adopted, but if there are other methods open even now to put an end to this tendency, it could have been done. There are other remedies open to curb that tendency instead of frequently seeking amendments to the Constitution.

† **Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.**—I am glad that all members have welcomed this measure and felt that this may be ratified. Sri G. V. Gowda seems to have certain suspicion as to why this clause is necessary, why this oath is necessary even at the time of filing nomination. There are certain elements in this country who want to make a political capital, a political campaign at the time of election; just to prevent that, this clause has been added that he must make the oath at the time of filing the nomination. I do not think there is any necessity to give a detailed reply to the arguments made by my friends because they have supported the measure. But I am inclined to meet the points raised by my friend from Shimoga District. He made one point that merely passing it would not help. In the law, certain offences are made punishable and have to be made punishable and because the people may commit offences in spite of the law, we cannot argue that there will have to be no law. People who do carry on propaganda against the integrity, the sovereignty of the country, must be punished. Even when they file nominations, when they contest elections and when they become members, it is necessary to take the oath of allegiance to the sovereignty and integrity of this country. My friend from K. G. F. said that it was the ruling party that had been responsible. Possibly, he has nothing more to say except by way of argument. If we want to encourage such things, why should we bring any Bill at all? Therefore, I commend this Bill for the ratification of the House.

✓ **Mr. SPEAKER.**—I will put it to vote. The question is:

“That this House ratifies the amendments to the Constitution of India, proposed to be made by the Constitution (16th Amendment) Bill, 1963, as passed by the Houses of Parliament.”

The motion was adopted.
